

REMARKS / ARGUMENTS

Claims 1, 6, 7, 12 and 15-17 were rejected. Applicants have amended claim 1.

The examiner rejected claims 1, 6, 7, 12, 15-17 under 35 U.S.C. 112 second paragraph as being indefinite. The examiner correctly pointed out that the term "radially deeper than the gear" was ambiguous as it did not define what part of the gear did the groove or the side boundary layer surface extend deeper than.

By way of the amendment applicants inserted that the groove and side boundary portion extend radially deeper than the "trough or otherwise lowest surface between the gear teeth" of the gear. This clarifies that applicants are not referring to the crest of the gear teeth. With this clarification applicants respectfully request the examiner to withdraw this rejection.

Claims 1, 6, 7, 12 and 15-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Bell et al US 6,609,672.

The examiner noted that the crest of the gear teeth in Bell et al could be construed to be above a space which arguably could be, by a broad meaning, defined as a groove and that the groove between the flange and the gear teeth is defined by a sidewall comprised of the flange itself and a lower portion comprised of the torsion bar itself, and a radially higher adjacent sidewall comprised of a radially lower portion of the gear etc. The examiner noted the features upon which applicant relies on i.e. gear teeth, trough are not recited in the claims. Accordingly the examiner could make this rejection based on the indefiniteness of the failure to state which part of the gear applicant referred to.

Applicant rectified this issue by this amendment and furthermore recited the groove has generally radially inclined side boundary surfaces. As best understood the circumferential space shown in Bell et al would comprise something other than a groove with radially inclined side boundary surfaces or sidewalls. Applicants added this feature to clarify what was meant by a groove in this context the base or bottom of the groove as claimed would be cut deep into the torsion bar whereas no such similar feature is found in the Bell et al reference. For these reasons applicants respectfully request the examiner withdraw this rejection and allow this application to pass to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

/Lonnie R. Drayer/ 02 May 2006

Lonnie R. Drayer, Registration No. 30,375
Attorney for Applicants

Key Safety Systems, Inc.
5300 Allen K Breed Hwy.
Lakeland, Florida 33811-1130
Phone: (863) 668-6707 Fax: (863) 668-6130